

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 remain in the application and claims 1, 14, and 27 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-37 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Burns et al. in view of Cooper et al.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Burns et al. and Cooper et al. fails to show or suggest a first identification storing unit for storing second identification data (decryption key) and a first signal processing unit for decoding data using the decryption key both formed in the same single integrated circuit. See the paragraph bridging pages 16-17 and Fig. 2 of the present application, for example. The combination of Burns et al. and Cooper et al. is silent about the above-described features of the present invention.

An advantage of the above-noted features of the present invention is that the first signal processing unit decodes the data transmitted through the second transmitting/receiving unit based on the decryption key stored in the first identification storing unit without sending out the decryption key, because the first signal processing unit and the first identification storing unit are formed in a single integrated circuit. This configuration results in a more secure system

than the one disclosed in the cited references.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Burns et al. teaches away from having the first identification storing unit and the first signal processing unit formed in the same single integrated circuit. Burns et al. as pointed to the Office Action at col. 5, lines 51-57, teaches that the decryption is done by network clients which are remote from the first identification storing unit identified in the Office Action as item 8 in Fig. 1.


Applicants respectfully request that it be pointed to where Burns et al. discloses that the first identification storing unit and the first signal processing unit are formed in the same single integrated circuit.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Burns et al. in view of Cooper et al.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jay H. Maioli  
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:pmc